

CAUSE as the Deep Semantic Source of So-called “Causative” and “Passive”*

—With Special Reference to Metaphorical Interpretation
of the *-i* Morpheme in Korean

Han-Kon Kim

0. Traditionally the Korean verb *poi* (보이다) has been regarded to be syntactically ambivalent in that it functions as an intransitive verb as in (1a) and also as a transitive “causative” verb as in (1b).¹

- (1) a. na-nun san-i po-i-n-ta.
I -Top hill-SM see C Pres SM
‘I see a hill.’
b. yeng-i-ka na-eykey kkotsin-ul po-i-ess-ta.
yeng-i-SM I-IO flowery shoes-DO see C Pst-SE
‘Yeng-i showed me flowery shoes.’
(Top=Topic Marker, SM=Subject Marker, C=CAUSE², Pres=Present, Mod=Modality, SE=Sentence Ending, IO=Indirect Object, DO=Direct Object, Pst=Past)

On the other hand, Korean has the simple verb *po* (보다) which is undisputably a transitive verb. See (2a).

- (2) a. nay-ka kkotsin-ul po-n-ta.
I -SM flowery shoes-DO see Pres SE
‘I see flowery shoes.’
b. *yeng-i-ka na-eykey kkotsin-ul po-n-ta.
yeng-i-SM I -IO flowery shoes-DO see-Pres -SE
‘*Yeng-i sees me flowery shoes.’

* This is an expanded written version of my paper read at the annual conference of the Society of Korean Linguistics held in Suwon on December 12, 1981.

¹ Samuel Martin’s Yale Romanization is employed in representing Korean with minor alteration which would be clear from the context.

² The meaning of the symbol CAUSE will be clarified later in Section 2.2. Before we come to its definition, the reader is advised to take it to represent traditionally accepted “causative” morpheme.

As *po* is a purely transitive verb without any implication of causation, a sentence like (2b) is totally out. On the other hand, observe (1b) which uses the causative from *po-i* instead of *po* and which is consequently acceptable. The puzzle here is why the simple intransitive verb *po* plus the *-i* morpheme appears to function as an intransitive verb in (1a). *-I* is generally considered to function both as a causative morpheme and a passive morpheme in Korean, thus constituting a homonym.³

The purpose of this paper is three-fold. First, it purports to present an analysis of *po-i* as a "causative" transitive just like the other dative case like (1b). Second, it attempts to present a semantic analysis of *-i* in which the *-i* morpheme is assumed to have the basic meaning of (*be*) *the cause*, instead of the traditionally accepted meaning of *do the act of causing*. Henceforward this semantic feature will be represented by CAUSE. Third, a highly tentative analysis of "causative" and "passive" will be given to the effect that their meaning can be derived from sentences with the *-i* morpheme on basis of the basic meaning CAUSE of *-i* and some semantic as well as pragmatic processes of inference.

1.0. As a preparatory step toward our analysis of the verb *po-i*, let us compare (1a) repeated as (3a) below with (3b, c, d).

- (3) a. na-nun san-i po -i -n -ta.
 I -Top hill-SM see -C -Pres-SE
 'I see a hill.'
- b. Chelswu-nun meri-ga khu-ta.
 Chelswu-Top head-SM big -Pres SE
 'As for Chulswu, his head is big.
 ⇒ Chelswu has a big head.'
- c. na-eykey san-i po -i -n -ta.
 I-IO hill-SM see-C-Pres-SE
 'I can see a hill.'
- d. san -i (na-eykey) po -i -n -ta.
 hill-SM I -IO see-C-Pres -SE
 'I can see a hill.'

Comparison of (3a) and (3b) shows us the possibility that *I* and *Chulswu* are respectively topics while *san* and *meri* are subjects of the sentences. Perhaps native intuition of this kind led to the traditional view that *po-i* is an intransitive verb. Incidentally, a couple of native speakers (as the writer also happens to be one) informed the writer that they felt (3a) was a kind of passive. This sense of passiveness is probably due to an intuitive observation that subject-marked *san* 'hill' could be nothing but the subject of *po-i* which then has to be interpreted as passive, for a hill could not possibly "see" an object while "I" could see an object, i.e., the hill.

³ The morpheme *-i* in its actual forms appears as *-i*, *-hi*, *-ki*, *-li*, and even as *-wu*. We do not, however, concern us with these phonological variations.

Comparison of (3a) and (3c) further confirms that *san* is the subject of *po-i* with preceding *na-eykey* functioning as a clearly marked indirect object. It can be seen in (3d) that this indirect object *na-eykey* can be readily inverted with the subject *san-i* and can also be deleted. With its indirect object deleted as in (3d), *san-i* turns out to look much more subject-like, hence offering much stronger confirmation of intransitivity of *po-i* and hence offering some justification of viewing the verb as passive.

If we adopt the kind of analysis of topic that Park (1973) has proposed, the above line of observations lead us to a tentative postulation that (3a) comes from the source like (4a) and that (3b) comes from (4b).⁴

- (4) a. *na-nun* [*san-i na-eykey po-i-n -ta*]
 I -Top hill -SM I -IO see-C-Pres -SE
 b. *Chulswu-nun* [*meri-ka khu-ta*]
 Chulswu-Top head-SM big -Pres SE

The postulated structure (4a) is different from (3d) which is our concern in this paper only in that (4a) has the topic *na-nun* in addition to what (3d) consists of. Therefore, we assume that (3d) from which the topic *na-nun* has been excluded contains what is crucial with our discussion of the sentences (3a, b, c, and d).

1.1. Before we proceed to analyze (3c) or (3d) which is a recovered representation of (1a) = (3a) with the exclusion of the topic, let us observe (1b) which is more clearly "causative" and which looks superficially like a three-place predication. As we have a case of *po* functioning as a simple transitive verb as in (5a) below and as *-i* is intuitively a causative morpheme, we can easily postulate (6b) as a source structure for (1b) repeated as (6a).⁵

- (5) *nay-ka kkotsin -ul po-n -ta.*
 I -SM flowery shoes-DO see-Pres-SE
 'I see flowery shoes.'
 (6) a. *yeng-i-ka na-eykey kkotsin -ul po-i-ess -ta.*
 yeng-i-SM I -IO flowery shoes-DO see-C-Pst -SE
 'Yeng-i showed me flowery shoes.'
 b. *yeng-i-ka [na-ka kkotsin -ul po]-i-ess -ta.*
 yeng-i-SM [I -SM flowery shoes-DO see]C-Pst -SE

1.2. The postulation of (6b) as the underlying source of (6a) is further justifiable even

⁴ (4a) and (4b) are not meant to imply that the two coreferential *na*'s must necessarily be postulated and one of them be deleted. The writer speculates that the real picture of the nature of language use is not deletion of one coreferential constituent but pragmatic selection of one of the identical constituent.

⁵ Lee (1973) has done the same kind of analysis for the dative verb, but he did not apply the same kind of analysis to the superficially intransitive *po-i* and furthermore his analysis of the passive in relation to the causative is different from the present analysis.

if the arguments with regard to (7) and (8) might be considered too speculative and weak. This further justification or support of the type of structure like (6b) derives from the following set of sentences:

- (7) a. emeni -ka ai -eykey pap-ul mek-i -ess-ta.
 mother-SM child-IO rice-DO eat -C-Pst-SE
 'Mother fed her child with some rice.'
 b. emeni-ka [ai -ka pap-ul mek] -i-ess-ta
 child-SM rice-DO eat
 (8) emeni -ka [ai -ka pap-ul mek] -key ha-ess-ta.
 mother-SM child-SM rice-DO eat Cause Pst-SE
 'Mother caused/let her child eat the rice.'
 (9) ai-ka pap-ul mek-ess-ta.
 'The child ate the rice.'

In the case of (7a) it is too obvious that its underlying source has to be (7b) which has (9) embedded in the larger causative frame. This line of argument is undeniable because the constituent *mek-i* in (7a) consists of the two morphemes *mek* and *-i* and also because the subject of the *mek* part of the constituent involved is obviously *ai* 'child' superficially marked as indirect object, and the subject of the *-i* part of the constituent is *emeni* 'mother' which is marked as subject. Hence there is only one transformational process needed to change the underlying subject *ai-ka* into a surface indirect-object *ai-eykey*, i.e., Nominative-Dative transformation.

(10) The Nominative-Dative Transformation

Y-ka/i [Z-ka/i N-(l)ul V] i Mod-SE						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	2-ey(key)		4	5-6	7	

This line of argument is further supported in view of the existence of a sentence like (8) which is exactly parallel in structure, with (7a) and (7b) the only difference being that *-key ha* is the morphemic sequence for indicating the indirect causation.⁶ Interestingly enough, in the case of this indirect causation, the Nominative-Dative Transformation is optional and both the subject-marker and the indirect object-marker are acceptable. Another interesting phenomenon is that, in the case of the direct causation like (7a, b),

⁶ One difference between (7b) and (8) is obviously the fact that the former is direct causation while the latter is more often interpreted as indirect. As for the arguments on the difference between those two causations in Korean, see Shibatani (1972) and Yang (1973). I do not touch on the difference simply because it does not properly fit the line of argument in this paper. What I am mainly concerned in this paper is to show how the traditional causative and passive reading can be derived from a further deeper semantic category CAUSE, hence reducing the status of the passive and causative notions in the grammar and also to show that the causative and passive concepts can be decomposed into CAUSE and some pragmatic processes if we accept the concepts of metaphor into the grammar.

ai 'child' can also be marked with the direct object maker (*l*)*ul*, hence another version of (7a) as illustrated by (11) below.

- (11) *emeni -ka ai -lul pap-ul mek-i -ess-ta.*
 mother-SM child-DO rice-DO eat -C-Pst-SE
 'Mother fed her child with some rice.'

However, the writer's feeling about (11) compared with (7a) is that it sounds a little bit slangish or substandard. It would seem here that the choice of either the indirect or the direct object marking here is dependent on the strength of the transitivity of the *-i* causative morpheme. The stronger its transitivity is felt by the speaker, the greater tendency to mark the case closer to the direct object.

2.0. As our line of argument needs support from some pragmatic considerations, we present here some preamble with regard to these respects. In section 2.1. and 2.2 below we will see how pragmatic conditions in terms of volition, intention and action of the subject affects the interpretations of the sentence involved.

2.1. With regard to the structures (9) and (7b) which are reproduced below as (12a, b), we assign some pragmatic conditions with regard to volition, intention, and action of the two underlying subject *emeni* 'mother' (the subject of causation) and *ai* 'child' (the subject of the action of eating).

(12) a. (=9)	ai - ka	pap - ul	mek - ess-ta	
PC 1:	- V	- V	O V	
	- I	- I	O I	
	+ A	- A	+ A	
PC 2:	- V	- V	O V	
	+ I	- I	O I	
	+ A	- A	+ A	
PC 3:	+ V	- V	O V	
	+ I	- I	O I	
	+ A	- A	+ A	
b. (=7b)	emeni-ka	ai-ka	pap-ul	mek -i-ess-ta.
PC 1:	- V			O V
	- I			O I
	+ A			+ A
PC 2:	- V			O V
	+ I			O I
	+ A			+ A
PC 3:	+ V			O V
	+ I			O I
	+ A			+ A

(O: irrelevant or non-committal)

Pragmatic Condition 1 (PC 1) for (12a=9) describes a situation where the child himself

does not have volition or any intention to eat the rice but actually does the act of eating it. Such a case can be better described by a sentence like (13a) or (13b) where adverbial phrase *ekciro* 'unwillingly' or *silchiman* 'though do not like to' describes explicitly that he is not willing or intends to eat it.

- (13) a. ai -ka pap-ul ekciro mek-ess-ta.
 child-SM rice-DO unwillingly eat -Pst-SE
 'The child ate the rice against his will.'
- b. ai-ka sil(ess) chiman pap-ul mek-ess-ta.
 though he didn't like to
 'The child ate the rice though he didn't like to.'

Pragmatic Condition 2 describes a situation where the child himself does not have volition but where he definitely (by duress) intends or plans to eat the rice. In such a case, the actor intentionally tries to be more cooperative in case there happens to be any outside causer or cause that forces him to be more cooperative against his own volition. Such a situation might be described by sentence like (14a) and (14b).

- (14) a. ?ai -ka ku pap-ul ekciro -nama kyehoykhaye
 child-SM the rice-DO unwillingly-though according to plan/intentionally
 mek-ess-ta.
 eat -pst-SE
 'The child, even though against his will, ate the rice intentionally/according to his plan.'
- b. ai -ka silkhi-nun hayssciman pap-ul
 child-SM hate -though rice-DO
 chagun-changun mek-ess-ta.
 in orderly fashion/methodically eat -Pst-SE
 'Even though he did not like to do so, the child ate the rice in orderly fashion.'

In both of the sentences above, the first of which sounds marginal to the writer, the child does the act of eating the rice with some deliberate plans (hence, [+intentional]) even though he does not have volition to do so (hence, [-volition]). It may seem to some readers that volition and intention cannot be clearly distinguished in this manner and the writer does not claim to be very confident about this point, either. However, even if PCs 1 and 2 could be collapsed, the result does not affect our arguments very much as far as our major claims in this paper are concerned. Therefore I would personally like to retain the type of analysis presented here.

Pragmatic Condition 3 describes a situation where the child is willing to eat the rice, intends to set up his own plan to do so, and does in fact the act of eating it himself. I do not think there is any problem with regard to this situation. In order to illustrate this last situation we could very easily add to (12) such adverbial phrases like *culkei* 'with

pleasure', *kikkei* 'willingly', *chakunchakun* 'methodically', *kyehoykcekuro* 'according to a plan', etc.

As for (12b) where pragmatic conditions for the matrix sentence with reference to *emeni* 'mother' and -i 'CAUSE' are dealt with, PC's for the subject *emeni* are equivalent to those of *ai* 'child' in (12a). For this latter case, as for the case of (12a), we could very easily imagine a situation in which the mother unwillingly and unintentionally did the act of causing the child to eat the rice, a situation where she unwillingly but intentionally did the act of causing him to do so, or a situation where she willingly and intentionally did the act of causing him to do so.

Now, the most complicated variations of situations arise where the pragmatic conditions of (12a) react with those of the matrix subject of (12b) when the former is embedded in the latter, a causative construction. The possibilities are nine (i.e. 3×3) but we do not venture to illustrate all of them. A skeleton picture is the following: the first major cases are when the matrix subject does the act of causing although he is unwilling to do so and when the embedded subject does the caused act though he is not willing to. In this first group of cases the real instigator of the act of causing and the act of the embedded subject is some one other than those two. The second major cases are when the matrix subject does the act of causing even though he is not willing to (the same as the first group of cases in this respect) and when the embedded subject is willing to do the act which he in fact does. This group of cases are in fact possible which are illustrated by a sentence like (15).

- (15) *emeni -nun naykhici anhayss-una ai -eykey*
 mother-SM didn't feel like -though child-IO
collita mothay pap-ul mek-i -ess-ta.
 entreated couldn't resist rice-DO eat -C-Pst-SE
 'Even though the mother did not feel like to do so, she could not resist the entreaties of the child and fed him with rice.'

The third group of cases are when the matrix subject is willing to do the act of causing which he in fact does, and when the embedded subject unwillingly does the act caused by the matrix subject. This kind of situation is illustrated by (16).

- (16) *emeni -ka ai -eykey pap-ul ekciro mek-i -ess-ta.*
 mother-SM child-IO rice-DO by force eat -C-Pst-SE
 'The mother forced (i.e. caused by force) the child to eat the rice.'

The fourth group of cases are when the matrix subject is willing to do the act of causing which he in fact does, and when the embedded subject is also willing to do the act caused by the matrix subject and in fact does it. In this kind of situation the matrix subject and the embedded subject are happily cooperative.⁷

⁷ For a case where the embedded subject is unwilling to eat and where he does not intend to do so and where he is consequently not cooperative, (16) is not natural, and the sentence below would

This much preamble is considered necessary since our argument in this paper is to the effect that the interpretations of the so-called "causative" and "passive" are to be derived from the same source CAUSE by means of the speaker-hearer's pragmatic inference based upon the same type of pragmatic conditions explicated above.

2.2. In the discussions of *poi* in (6a, b) and *meki* in (7a, b) above, it was shown that the *-i* morpheme gets a causative interpretation. In a case like (17a), however, the possibility of causative interpretation seems to be far less obvious than in the case of (6a, b) and (7a, b).

- (17) a. na-nun yeng-i-ka po-i-n -ta.
 I -Top yeng-i-SM see-C-Press-SE
 'I can see Yeng-i.'
 b. na-nun [yeng-i-ka na-eykey po-i-n-ta]

As we have already posited a structure like (17b) as the underlying source for (17a), the structure to be analyzed with regard to the *-i*-construction is basically (18).

- (18) yeng-i-ka na-eykey po-i-n -ta
 yeng-i-SM I -IO see-C-Pres -SE
 'I can see Yeng-i (Yeng-i can be seen by/to me).'

This again can be analyzed as having (19) as its underlying source according to our analysis of (1b) and (6a, b).

- (19) yeng-i-ka [nay-ka yeng-i-lul po-] i-n -ta
 yeng-i-SM I -SM yeng-i-DO see C-Pres -SE

The idea of (19) is that the basic meaning of (18) is 'Yeng-i *causes* that I see her.' There is, however, one thing very unique about this *-i*. The unique feature, I contend, is that *-i* is non-committal about whether Yeng-i is willing or unwilling to show herself to *na* 'I' which is the embedded subject. What I mean is that English sentence like "Yeng-i caused me to see her" is generally assumed to be decomposable into *do-cause* or *act as the cause of*, but that the Korean *-i* ought to be taken simply to mean *be the cause* without any implication of the *act* of causing. In other words, the "causative" predicate *-i* is capable of taking even an animate subject like *Yeng-i* without the slightest implication of its animacy and taking it simply to *be the cause of* some state of affairs.⁸

This line of argument can draw very strong support from the following observations. Look at (20a, b).

sound much more acceptable.

emeni -ka ai -eykey pap-ul ekciro phe-ne-ess-ta.
 mother-SM child-IO rice-DO by force put-in-Pst-SE

'The mother forced the rice into (the mouth of) the child.'

⁸ I personally tend to assume that English "causative" can also be analyzed along this line with more benefit, but I am not at the moment prepared to present any systematic analysis.

- (20) a. yeng-i-ka na-eykey hepekci-lul po -i -ess-ta.
 yeng-i-SM I -IO thigh -DO see-C-Pst-SE
 'Yeng-i showed me her thigh.'
- b. yeng-i-ka pwucwuuihaye na-eykey hepekci-lul po -i -ess-ta.
 yeng-i-SM inadvertently I -IO thigh -DO see -C-Pst-SE
 'Yeng-i inadvertently let me see her thigh.'

Our analysis gives (21) as the source structure (except for *pwucwuuihaye*) for both (20a) and (20b).

- (21) yeng-i-ka [na-ka hepekci-lul po-] i-ess-ta.
 yeng-i-SM I -SM thigh -DO see C-Pst-SE
 'Yeng-i was the cause of my seeing her thigh.'

When analyzed as (21), it can be speculated that (20a) is ambiguous with regard to the volition of *Yeng-i*, who is the matrix subject. On a pragmatic account, she can be either willing or unwilling to do the act of causing the embedded *na* to see her thigh. In the first case, the interpretation of (20a) would be in English "Yeng-i showed me her thigh (on purpose)." In the latter case, however, the interpretation would be something closer to "She was an inadvertent cause of the situation that I saw her thigh." And the complete naturalness of (20b) lends strong support to this observation.⁹

My arguments up to this point can be summarized as follows: the meaning of *-i* morpheme in Korean is basically *(be) the cause of* without any implication of the *do the act of* portion in its derived meaning *do the act of causing*, and the interpretation of whether the subject in fact do or do not do such an act is either expressed by context (like the adverb *pwucwuuihaye* 'inadvertently') or interpreted by the speaker-hearer on basis of pragmatic conditions like real situations and possible or imaginable situations. In order to facilitate our discussion we will call this CAUSE without any implication of doing something the "basic meaning" (BM) and the contextually or pragmatically interpreted meaning the "pragmatically inferred meaning" (henceforward PIM).

2.3. Our analysis of (20a, b) above gives us a very intriguing clue to the analysis of (3a, c, and d) along the same line. As it is now obvious that the matrix subject of *-i* can be interpreted to be either willing or unwilling or noncommittal as to the volition of being the cause of some state of affairs, the underlying source of (3a, c, d) could also be assumed to have the same configuration as (21) as given in (22).

- (22) san-i [na-ka san-ul po-] i-n -ta
 hill-SM I -SM hill-DO see C-Pres-SE

'The hill is the cause of the state of affairs that I see it. → I can see the hill.'

⁹ In a revised analysis to be proposed in Sections 3.4-3.4.2, the passive reading will be given a deep source which has a double-*i* construction. According to the double-*i* hypothesis (19a) on the passive reading would be underlyed by the following:

yengi-ka [Y-ka/i [nay-ka hepekci-lul po] i₁] i₂ ess-ta.

From this kind of analysis we can even infer an interpretation like "the hill lets me see it" not in the sense that the hill does the *act* of letting me see it, but in the sense that the hill is there and is the CAUSE of letting me see it from here. This line of interpretation which has a very strong flavor of metaphorical interpretation which has been banned from the Chomskian transformational-generative grammar. Metaphors are, however, so abundant and constitute so essential an ingredient of the often harped-upon originality and creativity of language that a grammar which excludes proper considerations about metaphor is doomed to failure. Weinreich(1966), even at the early period of the conception of transformational grammar, was keen enough to observe this point, but it was only recently that linguists began to pay proper attention to the metaphorical aspects of language.

To recapitulate what I have speculatively argued in Sections 1 and 2, sentences like (3a,c,d) can be deduced to have an underlying structure like (22) and the Korean "causative" morpheme *-i* has the meaning CAUSE without any implication of *do the act of*. Hence, I will from now on distinguish "causative" which I use in the sense of *do the act of causing* and CAUSE which I use in the sense of *(be) the cause of*. In the following sections, I will argue, on basis of the analysis I have presented and also on basis of pragmatic processes of inference, how the "causative" and the "passive" interpretations can be inferred or derived from the basic notion of CAUSE, hence proving those two concepts to be derived rather than basic in semantics or grammar.

3.0. *I*-verbs in Korean will, for mere convenience, be classified into two categories: (1) Transitive+*i* group and (2) Intransitive+*i* group. From a semantic point of view, it is already known that the category of adjective can be treated as verb and accordingly we do not treat them separately.

3.1. VT+*i* Interpreted as Causative

Verbs in the first category, as has already been mentioned at the beginning of this paper, function as intransitive verbs on the surface level. *Poi* is one of such example (See (1a)=(3a), (3c,d).). Some others function as dative verbs. *Poi*, which, as mentioned already, functions as an intransitive verb, functions also as a dative verb ((1b) and (6a)) and *meki* (feed; cause...to eat) is another such example (7a).

For convenience of exposition, let us call the original verb the root form and call the verb plus *-i* forms either VT+*i* or VI+*i*. Then the type of verb category and the number

(23)

Lexical item	Type	Category	Number of argumeets
<i>po</i>	Root	Transitive	2-place predicate, e.g. (2a).
<i>po-i</i>	V+ <i>i</i>	Intransitive Dative	1-place, e.g.(3d), or 2-place predicate, e.g.(3a, c). 3-place predicate, e.g. (6a).
<i>mek</i>	Root	Transitive	2-place predicate, e.g. (9).
<i>mek-i</i>	V+ <i>i</i>	Dative	3-place predicate, e.g. (7).

of arguments for the root and the *V+i* forms of *po* and *mek* as seen from a superficial viewpoint can be tabulated as (23).

It can be obviously seen in the tabulation that there must be some misconception here: the same 2-place transitive verb *po* and *mek* are taken to be syntactically different when they are affixed with *-i*: *po-i* seems to behave like 1- or 2-place intransitive verb or 3-place dative verb while *mek-i* seems to behave only as a 3-place dative verb. It is clear that this disparity can be dispensed with if our causative interpretation is uniformly applied to both of these forms as we attempted in Sections 1 and 2. In our analysis both of these verbs turn out to be underlied by the same construction represented by (24).

(24) [Y-ka [Z-ka N-ul V₀] -i] Mod-SE

(24) is assumed to be the general underlying structure for any VT+*i* type verbs regardless of whether such a verb is superficially 1-, 2-, or 3-place predicate or whether it is intransitive or dative. As we have already seen, the embedded subject *Z-ka* goes through Nominative-Dative transformation and become *Z-eykey* in the surface form. Note, however, a very interesting fact that when *Z* is a [-Human] subject *Z-ka* changes into a simpler form *Z-ey* which is not followed further by *-key*.

(25) a. sikmo-ka os -ey phwu -ul mek-i -ess-ta.
maid -SM clothes-IO starch -OM eat -C-Pst-SE

'The maid starched the clothes.'

b. sikmo-ka (os -ka phwul-ul mek) -i-ess-ta
clothes-SM

'The maid caused the clothes to eat starch. (Literal translation.)'

If we assume (25b) to be underlying (25a), the description becomes very straightforward. The only possible objection to (25b) would be that *os* 'clothes' could not possibly eat starch. However, as we have already assumed a grammatical model where metaphor is freely admitted, there is no reason to ban an inanimate subject "eating" or taking in some substance. Hence the Nominative-Dative transformation (10) would have incorporated in it conditions pertaining to the animate-inanimateness of the embedded subject.

(26) The Nominative-Dative Transformation (Revised)

Y-ka/i [Z-ka/i N-(l)ul V] i Mod-SE

1	2 - 3	4	5	6	7	⇒
1	2 -ey(key)	4	5	6	7	

Conditions: 3⇒ey if Z=[-Animate]
3⇒eykey if Z=[+Animate]

The reader here is reminded again of our assumption incorporated in the Nominative-Dative transformation (10) that NP-*ka/i*, the subject of the embedded sentence, may comprise both animate and inanimate subjects.

3.2. VI+*i* Interpreted as Causative

The following examples are those falling in this category which are interpreted in the causative meaning.

- (27) a. sensayngnim-i haksayng-ul us -ki-ess-ta.
 teacher -SM student -DO laugh-C -Pst-SE
 'The teacher caused/made the student (to) laugh.'
 b. sensayngnim-i [haksayng-i us]-(k)i-ess-ta
 SM laugh C-Pst-SE
- (28) a. nay kkol -i aitul -ul us -ki-ess-ta.
 my funny appearance-SM children-DO laugh-C -Pst-SE
 'My funny appearance made the children laugh.'
 b. nay kkol -i [aitul -i us] -(k)i-ess-ta.
 my funny appearance-SM children-SM laugh-C -Pst-SE
- (29) a. Seoul-si -ka Chongno -lul nelp-hi-ess-ta.
 Seoul-city-SM Chongno street-DO wide-C -Pst-SE
 'Seoul city widened Chongno street.'
 b. Seoul-si-ka [Chongno-ka nelp] (h)i-ess-ta
- (30) a. sikmo-ka phwul-ul nwuk -i -ess-ta.
 maid -SM starch-DO ductile -C-Pst-SE
 'The maid made the paste/starch ductile.'
 b. sikmo-ka [phwul-i nwuk] -i-ess-ta
- (31) a. Pomi-ka ku-ui elkwul-ul pwulk-hi-ess-ta.
 Pomy-SM her face -DO red -C-Pst-SE
 'Pomi reddened her face.'
 b. Pomi-ka ku-ui [elkwul-i pwulk] (h)i-ess-ta

The example above are all cases of VI+*i* functioning as the causative verb. In line with the argument that is represented by the general underlying representation (24), we could again conceive of the general underlying representation like (32).

- (32) [Y-ka [Z-ka V₀]-i] Mod-SE

Observe that the only difference between (24) and (32) is that the latter lacks N of (24).

On the surface level the *-i* morpheme changes a VI into a 2-place predicate and a VT into a 3-place predicate. In general terms, as we would naturally expect, the *-i* morpheme has the function of changing an n-place predicate into an n+1-place predicate.

In the case of VI+*i*, however, there is a difference from the case of VT+*i* group. In the VT+*i* group discussed in the previous section, one necessary transformational process after embedding an S into the *-i* context was the Nominative-Dative transformation (26). In the case of VI+*i* group like (27)~(30) above, however, the Nominative-Accusative transformation (33) seems to be necessary.

(33) The Nominative-Accusative Transformation

Y-ka/i	[Z-ka/i	V	i]	Mod-SE	
1	2-3	4	5	6	\Rightarrow
1	2-(1)ul	4	- 5	6	

Here, an objection may be raised to the effect that it is ad hoc to have two different rules of transformation as the result of embedding an S into the same *-i* context. There seems to be, however, very natural explanation for it, and it pertains to an observation regarding the number of arguments of a predicate. It is as simple as this: it seems to be universal that if a predicate is 1-place at all, that one argument naturally surfaces as the subject. If a predicate is 2-place, then they constitute the pair of the subject and the direct object. In the case of a 3-place predicate, it has the triple consisting of the subject, the direct object and the indirect object. This seems to constitute a natural tendency in the choice of a number of surface cases which tends toward the following hierarchy.

(34) The Surface-Case Choice Hierarchy

Nominative - Accusative - Dative

If we incorporate the idea of (34) into the transformational processes (26) and (33) we come to grip with a very interesting principle governing the transformation of embedded subject into a surface case. That is, the embedded subject assume the next highest case in (34) under the case(s) already taken by the other surface NP's. If we formulate this principle as (35) and incorporate in our grammar, the transformational rules like (26) and (34) can be dispensed with.

(35) The Surface-Case Choice Principle

The embedded subject assumes on the surface level the next highest case in the surface case choice hierarchy under the case(s) already taken by the other surface NP(s).

3.3. VT+*i* Interpreted as Passive.

Now, the discussion of the passive interpretation of Root+*i* is in order. Let us first look at the following examples.

- (36) a. kyengchal-i totwuk-ul cap -ass-ta.
policeman-SM thief -DO arrest-Pst-SE
'The policeman arrested the thief.'
b. totwuk-i kyengchal-eykey cap-hi-ess-ta.
'The thief was caught by the policeman.'
- (37) swuni-ka totwuk-eykey son -ul cap-hi-ess-ta.
swuni-SM thief -IO/by hand-DO
'Swuni got her hand taken by the thief.'
- (38) chelswu-ka swuni-eykey yakcem-ul cap-hi-ess-ta.
chelswu-SM swuni-IO/by fault -DO

'Chelswu was found fault with by Swuni./Chelswu was found to have weaknesses by Swuni.'

- (39) swuni-ka centangpho-ey sikey-lul cap-(h)i-ess-ta.
pawn -IO watch-Do

'Swuni put her watch in pawn.'

(36) which is the only active examples among (36)~(39), has the subject, the direct object, and the transitive verb *cap* 'take' which means literally "take". The three examples (36b), (37), and (38) have all passive interpretations. On the other hand, (39) has a causative interpretation. The problem here is what the factors are that cause the passive or the causative interpretations possible.

Let us first take up the passive interpretation. In line with the generalized underlying form (24) for the causative interpretation already discussed in the preceding sections, let us tentatively assume that (24) is also the underlying configuration for the passive interpretation of the Root+*i* form. Then the underlying structure for (36b) would be like (40).

- (40) totwuk-i [kyengchal-i totwuk-ul cap]-(h)i-ess-ta
robber -SM policema -SM robber -DO take C -Pst-SE

With the same underlying configuration for both passive and causative interpretations, the only plausible differentiating factor would seem to be the fact that for the case of passive interpretation the referential identity of Y and N of (24) is required whereas it is not required for the causative interpretation. And this assumption is testified by (40) where *totwuk-i*, the matrix subject, and *totwuk-ul*, the embedded direct object are coreferential, hence seemingly triggering the causative interpretation. This observation further seems to be confirmed by some native speakers' intuitive feeling that sentences like (3c, d) and (18)~(19) offer at least some possibility of the passive interpretation as has already been observed.

Pending any further confirmation of our assumption above, let us further observe (37) where the coreferentiality is not as direct as it is in (36b). In the case of (37), the matrix subject and the embedded direct object may be taken to be coreferential in that *son-ul* obviously refers to Swuni's hand—i.e. *son* 'hand' is an inalienable part of *Swuni*. This observation can also be further advanced to the case of (38). *yakcem* 'defect, weakness' can also be regarded as a quasi-inalienable part of *Swuni* in the sense that her defects or weaknesses are also a kind of inalienable attribute of hers.

(39) also seems to offer no problem since it has an un-coreferential alienable part of a matrix subject as the direct object, hence lending the causative interpretation—i.e. it means literally that Swuni caused the pawnbroker to take in her watch, hence "Swuni had her watch put in pawn." So far so good.

This coreferentiality hypothesis, however, gets stranded with the example like (20)~(21). Even though (20) has the underlying structure (21) which does satisfy our core-

ferentiality hypothesis, it gets the causative interpretation. Our coreferentiality hypothesis, however, seems to be intuitively so persuasive in that the direct object is universally the prime candidate for the surface subject of a passive sentence, hence the deletion of embedded direct object under the condition of coreferentiality with the matrix subject seems naturally to lead to the passive interpretation.

Then, it is quite plausible that our coreferentiality principle is not a sufficient but only a necessary condition for a passive interpretation. Then, we can surmise that (20)~(21) fails to get the passive interpretation not because of the failure of our coreferentiality but because the sentence does not probably satisfy some other condition which is also necessary but not sufficient. Let us, here, leave our argument into discussions of the VI+*i* forms interpreted as passive, at the end of which we could resume our discussion of the problem.¹⁰

3.4. VI+*i* Interpreted as Passive

As the first example of VI+*i* group, we take *wul*+*i* 'cry+C'.

- (41) ai -ka wul-ess-ta.
child-SM cry -Pst-SE
'The child cried.'

- (42) a. ku -salam-i ai -lul wul-i -ess-ta.
the-man -SM child-DO cry -C-Pst-SE
'The man made the child cry.'
b. ku-salam-i [ai -ka wul] -i-ess-ta
child-SM

(41) is an active version of the verb *wul* 'cry' and (42a) is the causative version, of which (42b) is the underlying structure. Now, look at (43a), which is a totally unacceptable passive version of the same verb.

- (43) a. *ai -ka ku -salam-eykey wul-(l)i-ess-ta.
child-SM the-man -IO cry C -Pst-SE
'The child was made to cry by the man.'
b. ai-ka [ku-salam-i [ai-ka wul (l)i₁] i₂]ess-ta

One of the most dependable explanatory procedure for the unacceptability of (43a) would be to postulate a different underlying structure for the causative and the passive interpretations and see what factors are involved in them. If we assume (24) to be the underlying configuration for (43a), then its underlying structure would be (42b). But the problem with (42b) as the underlying form for (43a) is that it does not have a configuration that

¹⁰ One additional comment is in order. It concerns the underlying structure for (39) as given in (i)

(i) swuni-ka [centangpho-ka sikiey-lul cap] (h) i-ess-ta.
swuni-SM pawnbroker-SM watch-DO take C-Pst-SE

(i) again takes the inanimate noun *centangpho* to be the subject of the verb *cap* 'take', which is quite natural in our system that takes metaphor to be a natural phenomenon in language.

is amenable to our coreferentiality test. In other words, it is good enough to be interpreted in a causative sense in that a causative matrix could intuitively have embedded in it any state of affairs that is describable by a 1-, 2-, or 3-place predicate. On the other hand, it (42b) does not have any possible candidate NP in the embedded sentence that could possibly be coreferential with the matrix subject, since it has only one argument *ai* 'child'. If that position is filled by a noun phrase coreferential with the matrix NP it would definitely have to be interpreted as reflexive causative.

One logical possibility then is to embed (42b) in yet another *-i* configuration with *ai* as its higher matrix subject. The result is (43b) which can be represented in the general form as (44).

(44) X-ka/i [Y-ka/i [Z-ka/i V₀] i₁] i₂ Mod-SE

An intuitive paraphrase of this configuration would read something like the following: X is the cause of the state of affairs in which Y is the cause of a state of affairs described by Z-ka/i+V₀. Hence, (43b) roughly reads: The child is the cause of the man's causing him to cry. The tenet of (43b) and (44) is that, in order for a structure to be given a passive interpretation, it should have a set of coreferential NP's, of which one is the matrix subject and the other is the embedded subject (in case of 1-place predicate) or the embedded direct object (in case of 2-place predicate).

(43b) and (44) might be judged by some to be intuitively unacceptable since the passive, from the view-point of the theme-rheme distinction, is nothing but the procedure of inverting the subject and the direct object. For where is the embedded object to be inverted with the matrix subject?

That question, however, is exactly what can be solved by assuming our double *-i* 'CAUSE' construction like (44). We have begun with an impossible passive construction like (43a) but there are many VI+*i* "passive" verbs in Korean which necessitates the double *-i* construction (see *wul-li*, *nal-li*, *cap-hi*, and *ttel-li* discussed below) and furthermore the impossible (43a) can be explained only in terms of (44). First of all, the absence of embedded object can be solved by assuming the deeper *-i*₁ context after the derivational procedure of which Z would be converted into the direct object of the V₀+*i*₁ causative. This is clearly shown by (42b)⇒(42a). Then the derived string which is embedded in *-i*₂ context with X as the subject provides the matrix *i* subject X with the possibly coreferential direct object Z. Hence, for an embedded subject of a 1-place intransitive verb to be interpreted as passive in the *-i* context, our double *-i* context seems to be optimally required.

Our contention is further supported by the following set of sentences.

- (45) a. cong-i alumtapkey wu-n -ta.
gong-SM beautifully cry-Pres-SE
'The gong rings beautifully.'

- b. *cong-i alumtapkey wul-li-n-ta.*
 gong-SM beautifully cry C Pres SE
 'This gong rings beautifully.'
- c. *i cong-i cal wul-li-n -ta.*
 this gong-SM easily cry C-Pres-SE
 'This gong can easily be made to ring. (a rough translation)'

The intransitive verb *wul-* 'cry' is used as in (45a) to mean 'ring'. This use is metaphorical in that (45a) describes the state of affairs in which the gong rings as if it were "crying" of its own. In other words, the attention is focused only on the state of affairs that the gong *is* ringing with a total disregard of who or what caused that ringing. On the other hand, (45b) has an interpretation quite different from that of (45a). An unnatural but faithful English translation of the sentence would be something like 'The bell can be beautifully rung'. To explicate it further, it means 'The bell has an attribute of being rung beautifully' or 'The bell is made in such a way that it can be made to "cry" beautifully'. For this kind of intuitive feeling, (44) would be the optimum underlying configuration. Using (44) as the underlying configuration, the underlying structure of (45b) would be:

- (46) *i cong-i [Y-ka/i [i cong-i alumtapkey ul] -i₁]-i₂ -n-ta*

An intuitive translation of (46) would be something like "this gong is the cause of Y's being the cause of the state of affairs in which the gong rings beautifully".

We have seen in the preceding paragraph that the meaning of (45b) is well represented by a structure like (46). If we take (47) below to underlie (45b) along the line of the configuration (32) then we can conceive of no systematic account of its meaning since there is no direct object occurring in the history of its derivation.

- (47) *Y-ka/i [cong-i alumtapkey ul] (l)i-n-ta*

A further convincing support of our double *-i* construction comes from an observation about the scope of the adverb *cal* in (45c). For our observation, let us first posit (48a) to be underlying the sentence in line with the general structure (44).

- (48) a. *i cong-i [Y-ka/i [i cong-i wul] i₁] cal i₂-n-ta*
 b. *i cong-i [Y-ka/i [i cong-i wul] cal i₁] i₂-n-ta*

The rough meaning of (45c) is something like: "This bell can easily be made to ring". The problem here is then what constituent the adverb *cal* is to modify. If we adopt the configuration (22) to underlie a "passive" construction like (45c), then we find no way of definitely pinning down a constituent as the scope of *cal*. Does the only and one existing *-(l)i* fall under its scope? How do we then explain the intuitive feeling that the implication of (45c) is to the effect that the gong has such an attribute that it easily lets someone to

cause itself to ring? The explication becomes very straightforward when (48a) is adopted. The intuitive account of (48a) is that someone (Y) causes the bell to ring and the bell is such that it easily lets such a situation happen. In this latter account, the scope of the adverb *cal* is no other constituent than $-i_2$ which is the predicate for the matrix subject *i cong*.

Our contention would be further confirmed if we could find a situation where the adverb concerned had $-i_1$ in its scope. (49) provides us with such a situation.

- (49) onul -un i cong-i cal wul-(l)i-n -ta.
 today-Top this bell -SM easily cry -C -Pres-SE
 'Today this bell is made to ring easily.
 ⇒ Today this bell rings easily.'

We can speculate here that, according to a pragmatic inference, the speaker-hearer infers *cal* to have $-i_1$ in its scope as represented by (48b) since *cong* 'bell' can not possibly be so changing that it easily lets someone ring it today whereas it didn't yesterday, for example. Consequently, the cause of the change of the state of affairs is attributed to the person Y who strikes the bell—presumably his manner of hitting the bell improved or even he is in a better condition than he was yesterday, etc. For the kind of situation as (49), consequently, the optimal underlying configuration has to be definitely (48b) rather than (24).¹¹

3.4.1. A very interesting observation is due to the following pairs of sentences.

- (50) a. yen-i palam-ey nal-li-ess-ta.
 kite-SM wind-by fly -C -Pst-SE
 'A kite is flown by the wind. ⇒ A kite is flown in the wind'.
 b. *yen-i poktong-eykey nal-li-ess-ta.
 'A kite is flown by Poktong.'
- (51) a. nongpwu-ka say-lul nal-li-ess-ta.
 peasant -SM bird-DO fly -C -Pst-SE
 'A peasant flew the bird away.
 ⇒ A peasant chased the bird away.'
 b. *say-ka nongbwu-eykey nal-li-ess-ta.
 bird-SM peasant -by fly -C -Pst-SE
 'Birds were chased away by the peasant.'
 c. *say-ka nongbwu-eykey nal-li-e-ci -ess-ta.
 bird-SM peasant -by fly -C -become/get -Pst-SE
 'Birds were chased away by the peasant.'

According to our theory, the underlying structure for (50a, b) would be (52).

- (52) yen-i [{ palam -i } [yen-i nal] i_1] i_2 ess-ta
 { Poktong-i }

¹¹ For a pragmatic account of the double $-i$ interpretation of the so-called "passive" and the scope of adverbials, see Kim(forthcoming).

The passive interpretation of (50) comes from (52) which roughly means "The kite was the cause (i.e. it let) of the wind's causing it to fly." The underlying structure for (50b) is the same as that of (50a) except for *Poktong* to be substituted for *palam*. Then (52) has to be sought for some factors which make its surface sentence (50b) unacceptable. A first tentative explanation would be a pragmatic constraint to the effect that a metaphorical interpretation should be applied to both *-i*'s in the double *-i* construction, hence an underlying form which does not allow this constraint to work would be out.

(53) Constraint on the Metaphorical Passive

For a double *-i* construction to be interpreted as passive, metaphorical interpretation should apply to both of the *-i*'s.

This constraint is further supported by the pair of sentences like (51a, b) where *nongbwu* and *say* are animate object and are capable of their own willing action. For a metaphorical interpretation to work, the subject of an *-i* morpheme must either be an inanimate object or its will must be suspended, i.e. be treated as inanimate. (51a) does not require a metaphorical interpretation since *nongbwu* can be pragmatically inferred to be the willing agent of the CAUSE. With (51b), however, this is not possible: it requires a metaphorical inference but its underlying structure does not admit of such an interpretation, for even if we were to allow the possibility of *say*, which is inhuman, being interpreted as a metaphorical subject, *nongbwu* certainly does not allow such a possibility.

A more interesting example is (51c). (*i*)-*e ci*- is usually observed to be a stronger passive device which makes a simple *-i* construction more acceptable as passive as illustrated by the following.

- (54) a. **ku ai -nun ku salam-eykey wul-(l)i-ess-ta.*
 the child-Top the man -by cry- C-Pst-SE
 b. (?)*ku ai -nun ku salam-eykey wul-(l)i-e ci-ess-ta.*
 the child-Top the man -by cry- C-become -Pst-SE/get
 'The child was made to cry by the man.'

Observe, however, that (51c) is unacceptable even with this *i-e ci* construction attached. We take this unacceptability to be due to the fact that this sentence does not satisfy our Constraint on Metaphorical Passive (53).

The unacceptability of (43a) is also explainable by (53). In order for the sentence to be given a passive interpretation the matrix subject *ai* must be treated as [-volition], hence incurring a metaphorical interpretation of *-i₂*. But this sentence explains a situation where the subject of *-i₁ ku salam* is acting with [+volition], hence shutting out the possibility of the metaphorical interpretation. Thus the sentence does not satisfy (53).

Here, we come back to one problem which was not solved with regard to the distinction between the causative and the passive interpretations with reference to examples, (20)-(21) and (36)-(40). On basis of the underlying structure (40) for sentences (36b)-(38),

we temporarily hypothesized that the general structure (24) underlies both the causative and the passive interpretation and that the condition for the passive interpretation was the coreference of the matrix subject and the embedded direct object. We, however, soon observed that (20)–(21) were counterexamples to our hypothesis and consequently that our coreferentiality condition might be only a necessary condition which required some other conditions to work jointly with it.

Now, we propose to retain the single *-i* construction like (24) for the causative interpretation and to adopt the double *-i* construction like (44) for the passive interpretation. The newly proposed configuration (55) is the same as (44) except for a newly introduced direct object N.

- (55) X-ka/i [Y-ka/i [Z-ka/i N-(l)ul V₀] i₁] i₂ Mod-SE

Then the underlying structures for (20) would be the same as before, i.e. (21), and that for (36b)–(38) would be (56a), (56b), and (56c) respectively.

- (56) a. totwuk-i [Y-ka/i [kyengchal-i totwuk-ul cap] i₁] i₂ ess-ta
 b. swuni-ka [Y-ka/i [totwuk-i son-ul cap] i₁] i₂ ess-ta
 c. chelswu-ka [Y-ka/i [swuni-ka yakcem-ul cap] i₁] i₂ ess-ta

Here, further explications of the variable nodes as well as of the double *-i*'s in (24) and (55) are in order. The innermost embedded sentence represents the state of affairs that can be minimally described by the root predicate involved. For (24), there is some entity and it is predicated of by an intransitive verb. For (55), there are two entities and a relation between the two entities as predicated of by the transitive verb. In the latter case, the action aimed at N originates from Z. The pair of a subject Y and its predicate *i*₁ represents the primary cause to which the state of affairs described by the innermost embedded sentence is due. What can be this primary cause will be discussed presently. The pair of the subject X and the predicate *i*₂ represent the secondary cause of the state of affairs to which Y's being the cause of Z's V-ing of N (in the case of the transitive verb) or of Z's being in the state of V-ing (in the case of the intransitive verb) is due. In other words, the X is the cause of being acted upon by Z or Y.

Our distinction of the causative and passive interpretation in terms of the underlying representations, i.e. by the distinction of the single *-i* and double *-i* constructions, is supported by an observation of the following set of sentences.

- (57) a. yen-i palam-ey nal-li-ess-ta.
 kite-SM wind -by fly -C-Pst-SE
 'The kite was flown in the wind ⇒ The kite flew in the wind.'
 b. palam-i yen-ul nal-li-ess-ta.
 wind -SM kite-DO fly -C-Pst-SE
 'The wind flew the kite.'

For (57a) and (57b), we can postulate the following underlying structures respectively.

- (58) a. *yen-i* [*palam-i* [*yen-i nal*] *i*₁] *i*₂ *ess-ta*
 X -SM Y -SM Z -SM fly C C Pst-SE
 b. *palam-i* [*yen-i nal*] *i-ess-ta*
 Y -SM Z -SM fly C-Pst-SE

The symbols X, Y, and Z assigns the constituents of those sentences to the general configuration (44). We can see in the above that in our system (58a) has (58b) embedded in it. This representation gives us a very systematic explanation of the relation between (57a) and (57b). (57b) is a sentence which lends us only a simple causative interpretation while (57a) as represented by (58a) gives us a passive interpretation by having (58b) embedded in it. Hence, although *nal* is an intransitive verb, its subject *yen* in the *-i*₁ context becomes the object of the causative verb *nal+i*₁, which again is deleted by its coreference with the matrix *yen* in the *i*₂ context and renders a passive interpretation.

A very interesting observation is made regarding the kinds of constituent that can occupy the position of Y in (44) and (55). Observe the following set of sentences.

- (59) a. *poktong-i* **kuui atul-i chwu-ese ttel -i-ess-ta.*
 poktong-SM his son -SM cold -because tremble-C-Pst-SE
 ‘*Poktong trembled due to his son’s being cold.’
 b. *poktong-i chwu-ey ttel -ess-ta.*
 poktong-SM cold -by tremble-Pst-SE
 ‘Poktong trembled because of the chilly weather.’
 c. ??*pokdong-i chwuwi-ey ttel-(l)i-ess-ta.*
 C -Pst-SE
 ‘Pokdong had to tremble due to the cold weather.’
 d. *poktong-i chwuwi-ttaymwun-ey ttel-li-ess-ta.*
 reason -by
 ‘Poktong had to tremble due to the cold weather.’
 e. *poktong-i chwu-ese ttel-li-ess-ta.*
 cold -because
 ‘Poktong had to tremble because he felt cold.’

Among these sentences, the most implausible sentence from the semantic view-point is (59a) where the content of Y of (44) is attributed to Poktong’s son being cold. Comparison of (59b) and (59c) shows that if the cause of Poktong’s trembling is expressed by a simple NP like *chwuwi-ey* the root form *ttel* is preferred to the *V+i* form. As the Y constituent is filled with a more explanatory and lengthy phrases like *chwuwi-ttaymwun-ey* ‘due to the cold’ or like *chwu-ese* (which may be regarded as a deleted or shortened sentence meaning ‘because he felt cold’), the sentence becomes more natural and acceptable. This observation leads us to expand the configuration (44) and (55) into one like (60).

- (60) W-(n)un [X-ka/i [Y-ka/i [Z-ka/i (N-lul) V₀] -i₁] -i₂] Mod-SE

NP
△
S

This configuration is meant to represent our observation that Y, which is the primary cause of the state of affairs represented by the embedded sentence, tends to prefer a constituent that has more sententiality to one that has more nouniness in the sense of Ross (1972).

3.4.2 The last observation which I think is very important is due to the following set of sentences.

- (61) a. na-nun nul co -n -ta.
I -Top. always snooze-Pres-SE
b. na-nun nul col -li-n -ta.
I -Top always snooze-C-Pres-SE
- (62) a. chelswu-nun nul co -nta.
chelswu-Top always snooze-Pres-SE
b. *chelswu-nun nul col-li-n-ta.
c. ??chelswu-nun nul col-nun-kuna.
d. ??chelswu-nun nul col-li-m-ey thulim-eps-ta.
e. chelswu-nun nul col-li-nun moyang-i-ta.
f. *chelswu-nun nul col-li-ni?
- (63) a. ney-ka nul co-n-ta.
b. *ney-ka col-li-n-ta.
c. ney-ka nul col-li-nun-kuna.
d. ?ney-ka nul col-li-m-ey thullim-eps-ta.
e. ney-ka enceyna col-li-nun moyang-i-ta.
f. ne-nun nul col-li-ni?

First, the difference between the meanings of (61a) and (61b) is that the former is focused on the state of affairs that "I am always in the state of dozing or snoozing" and the latter is focused on the state of affairs that "I always feel drowsy." The underlying structure for (61a) is simply Subject+Verb whereas (61b) is assumed to be underlied by (64) which is in line with the expanded configuration (60).

- (64) na-nun [nay-ka [Y-ka/i [nay-ka col] i₁] i₂] -n-ta.

This configuration represents the idea that the subject of *nay* of *i*₂ let the state of affairs happen in which some unspecified cause Y is the cause of the state of affairs that I feel drowsy.

A very strong further support of (60) is derivable from observations regarding (62) and (63). We observe in those sentences a tendency that *colli* is totally unacceptable with the third person *Chelswu* in (62) and the second person *ney* in (63). However, it becomes acceptable

In order to explain this, we can employ Grice's maxim of truth in conjunction with our configuration (60) or (64). (60) or (64) very well represents our intuition that *colli* does not simply describe the subject's (Z) state of being dosing, but represents there being some unspecified cause (Y) of the state and the subject (X) being unable to resist the state of being drowsy. In other words, *colli* describes a state of affairs which only the subject can claim to have access to perceiving. The reason (62b) and (63b) are unacceptable is due to the fact that they make statements about the third and the second persons' internal states without any reservation whatsoever. (62c, d, e) and (63c, d, e), on the other hand, express some reservations by using the devices of propositional attitude, and hence alleviates the degree of violation of Grice's maxim of truth. In order to make our contention look a little more neat, we could present the following configuration.

- Here, *nay-ka.....ko malhanta* 'I say that.....' is Austin's performative context formally represented and in case of *colli*, W, X, and Z, are coreferential. In general terms, if W, X, Z refer to the speaker himself, this configuration does not violate Grice's maxim of truth, but if they refer either to the second or the third person it *does* violate it. A further very interesting observation is due to comparison of (62f) and (63f). If we construct the performative context for the pair of sentences, we get (66).

- With this configuration it is straightforwardly explained that, for Grice's maxim to be fulfilled in a question, *ne* 'you' and W, X, Z must be coreferential for *colli*, for it would be impossible to get truthful information about the subject *you* from any other person than *you*. Therefore, (66) provides a very clear representation of the situation in which (62f) but not (63f) has to be totally out.

4.0. To recapitulate, I have proposed in this paper an entirely new semantic and pragmatic description of the Korean "causative" and "passive" morpheme *-i*. The causative

and passive interpretations were assumed to be derivable from the atomic source meaning CAUSE, the former being underlied by our single *-i* construction (24) and the latter being underlied by our double *-i* construction (60). The implication of my explanatory description is that in Korean there is no passive construction in the true sense of the term as it is employed for Indo-European languages like English. The passive meaning is conveyed by mean of parasitic device of our double *-i* context, hence constraint like (53) is necessary I suspect that (53) works only for the intransitive root but this requires a further research.

A second very important implication of this study is that much of the meaning which has been attributed to the sentence is not the meaning of the sentence itself in the proper sense of the word. The sentence or a lexical item has some basic meanings (BM) and a lot more meaning which superficially seems to be conveyed by the sentence is in reality derived or inferred meaning based upon the speaker-hearer's pragmatic inference. The derivation of the "causative" and "passive" interpretations is a very convincing testimony of the situation. This observation also confirms us that in the study of language in the future, we cannot afford to neglect pragmatic as well as semantic aspects of language use in order to understand language properly.

A third implication is about the possibility of decomposition of the concept *agent*. In our study, it was shown that the subject of Korean *-i* morpheme was merely CAUSE of the state of affairs without any implication of the *instigator* of the action. When it is the instigator, it can be interpreted in our terms as CAUSE WITH INTENTION AND/OR VOLITION. We have even made an observation that pragmatic conditions in terms of volition, intention, and action would be possible and actually attempted a very sketchy outline with regard to the *-i* morpheme.

A further direction of our study might be focused on how the double *-i* configuration affects the phonological aspects of the passive construction in Korean. For some dialect like Kyungsang dialect it is sometimes observed that the passive *-i* gets a higher and stronger tone or stress (e.g. *mekhiita*). It remains to be seen whether this phenomenon has any historical implications or source.

A totally neglected area in our study is phonological aspects with regard to the variations of the morpheme: *-i*, *-ki*, *-hi*, *-li*, and *-wu*.

Research in these untouched-upon area might shed light on the problems dealt with in this paper and might even force the writer to change his present view, which at the moment seems unlikely.

REFERENCES

- 박양규 (1978) '사동과 피동,' 국어학 7, 국어학회.
- 송호민 (1978) '사동의 두 형식,' 언어 3.2, 한국언어학회.
- 송병학 (1979) '한국어의 수동태,' 언어 4.2, 한국언어학회.
- 이상억 (1970) '국어의 사동 피동구문연구,' 국어연구 26.
- 최현배 (1926, 1961) 우리말본, 정음사.
- 허 응 (1975) 우리 옛말본 (15세기 국어형태론), 샘문화사.
- Kim, Han-Kon(forthcoming) 'The So-Called *i*-Passive in Korea.'
- Lee, Chung-min (1974) *Abstract Syntax and Korean with Reference to English*, Indiana Univ. Ph.D. dissertation,
- Park, Byeong-Soo (1973) 'On the Multiple Subject Construction in Korean,' *Linguistics* 100, Mouton, the Hague.
- Ross, John Robert (1972) 'The Category Squish: Endstation Hauptwort,' *CLS* 8.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1973) 'Lexical versus Periphrastic Causatives in Korean,' *Journal of Linguistics* 9, 281-98,
- Weinreich, Uriel (1966) 'Explorations in Semantic Theory,' in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics III*, Mouton, The Hague.
- Yang, In-Seok(1974) 'Two Causative Forms in Korean,' *Language Research*(어학연구) 10.1, Language Research Institute, Seoul National University.

Department of English

College of Humanities

Seoul National University

Kwanak-ku, Seoul 151

(Received 15, March 1982)